

FIRE PROTECTION POLICY BOARD

February 21, 2002
General Administration Building
Olympia, WA

Board Members Present: Chair Sharon Colby, Pat Jollota, Jim Potts, Jim Broman, Joe Coultman and Mark Kahley

WSP Staff Present: State Fire Marshal Mary Corso, Ellen Tombleson and Lieutenant Steve Kalmbach

OPENING

Chair Sharon Colby called the meeting to order at approximately 9:10. Introductions were made and the agenda was approved as written.

Jim Broman moved, and Jim Potts seconded to approve the minutes from December 7, 2001. Motion carried unanimously. The minutes from the December 7, 200, meeting were approved as written.

STATE FIRE MARSHAL REPORT – State Fire Marshal Mary Corso reported on the following items:

Legislative Update – Mary reported that the fireworks industry did continue with the bill they put in last year, with various changes (2SSB 6080). Mary advised that Mr. Farley, lobbyist for the fireworks industry, did go on record to say that he would work jointly with the State Fire Marshal's Office and the Washington State Association of State Fire Marshals to develop legislation for the following year to include further fines and civil penalties. One of the goals will be to eliminate/curtail the sale of the illegal fireworks in the state.

2002/03 Budget/Legislative Initiatives – Mary reviewed the following Budget/Legislative Deadlines:

First Deadline –	(03/25/02) – Budget Trial Balloons Due to Bureau Directors
Second Deadline -	(04/01/02) – Bureau Directors meet to decide which will move forward for further action.
Third Deadline -	(04/15/02) – Agency Request Legislation due
Fourth Deadline -	(05/03/02) – Scrubbed Budget Packages that make it through the 04/01/02 process will be presented during the Strategic Advancement Forum

State Fire Marshal Corso also provided an overview of the SAF process, advising that once a month the Bureau reports on their performance measures and data elements to the Chief and the Executive Staff. Mary added that this SAF may be a good session for the Fire Protection Policy Board members to attend.

Jim Broman commended Mary for including the Board early in the budget process, although he

feels the Board may be behind the power curve to discuss and develop items in time for the March deadline. He suggested the Board should set their agenda to begin looking at these issues in December, to allow for providing input with some substance. Sharon Colby directed this item be added to the Pending List, to be reviewed in November

Fire Training Academy Recruit School (Classes 2002-01 & 2002-02) – Mary advised that Bates Technical College opted not to renew the interagency agreement at the end of September due to cost issues. As a result of this decision, a team was established, consisting of approximately 40 users statewide to provide input on redefining and redesigning the Firefighter Recruit School. Bates Technical College was in support of using their curriculum as the foundation. Work was done to enhance the curriculum and the training began as a pilot with the first Recruit School of the year (2002-01) graduating on Monday, February 18.

Mary advised that the fee for the current Recruit School was established in 1995, at approximately \$1,205, which is not nearly adequate to meet the demands of having 28 instructors teach the class. An additional 2 weeks was added to Recruit School, making it a 10-week program. Fees for the 2002-01 and 02 classes have been established at \$3,080, a 24% increase. These first two classes in 2002 will be used to further refine and redefine the Recruit School course content. Meetings will be held every two weeks to review and evaluate the progress and to identify necessary changes for the next Recruit School. Also included in the pilot course will be a complete physical fitness and wellness program. Overseeing the physical fitness and wellness programs is Dr. Parker, who is a Doctor of Sports Medicine in Seattle. Mary explained that baselines will be established on the individual firefighter relative to their heart rate and what condition they are in on day one. They will then be evaluated by Dr. Parker throughout the process.

Other items that will be included in the pilot course include advanced fire suppression, firefighter survivability, hazmat operations and significantly increased live fire training opportunities. A nutritional program is also being established to ensure that the food the firefighters are eating during this high-risk environment matches up with the job they are doing.

Daily evaluations will be performed, to allow for monitoring the progress of the firefighters, and will be provided to their Fire Chief. Mary shared that those involved with the pilot recruit school are very excited, as this course is state-of-the art and built for the future. Mary commended the work of the 40- person team and expressed that the success of this course will reflect on them and the efforts they put forth.

Sharon Colby questioned if the repairs to the kitchen have been taken care of. Mary confirmed that a new kitchen hood system was completed and installed towards the end of December.

Fire Training Academy Recruit School (Classes 2002-03 and-04) –Mary advised that fees for these classes will be set at \$3,700, which is a \$520 increase (16%). The first two classes of the year are being done at a \$600 per person reduction because they are pilot courses. She advised that these costs are charging \$2,500 for their 9 1/2 week course. The Fire Training Academy cost is \$1,200 higher, as it includes food and lodging costs. It will take approximately 28 instructors to staff the 10-week course. Mary stated that the Multiple Company Officer (MCO)

classes will be re-established using the same process as was used to build the Recruit School. Stakeholders will be brought in to identify what the class should look like and necessary actions that need to be taken.

Jim Broman reflected back to the December 7, 2001, meeting when the 601 growth factors were discussed, which would allow for a 3.29% fee increase. He questioned the 24% and 16% increases, asking for clarification on reconciling the difference. Mary explained that there is a state law that will not allow for operating at a loss. Sharon Colby also advised that fees have not been adjusted since 1995. Mary advised that instructor costs and housing costs have increased and that the WSP Budget and Fiscal Office indicated the fee increases can be well defended. Jim clarified that he was not in opposition to the fee increase, that he was just reacting to the information he had from the December meeting.

Sharon Colby requested that a profile be developed to show who is using the FTA, detailing which districts and regions they are from, and what type of training they are taking advantage of. Mary will have this information e-mailed to the Board as soon as it is developed and available.

Mark Kahley stated that he felt we may be taking a position to actively violate law in accordance with I-601, by raising the fees by more than 6%. Although he agrees with the need to raise the fees, he recalls that to the best of his knowledge, this requires a vote of a legislative body. Mark suggested that if in fact the Board is going on record as saying that it is a necessity to raise the amounts, that the Board ought to have a recommendation that shows that the Board requests the appropriate legislative action to increase the fees, more than the amount ruled by law. At this point, Sharon Colby questioned if it is the FPPB's responsibility to pass approval over the raise in fees, or is this strictly up to the WSP? Sharon requested that although the raise in fees can be justified, that the record reflects the Board's concerns, due to legal formality.

Jim Broman pointed out that in RCW 43.43.9942 – FTA Fees/Schedules, It states that the WSP may impose and collect fees, for fire service training, establish and set fees schedules for the fire service training. Jim does not recall, or see anything in the statute that puts the FPPB in the position of having to approve fees. Sharon Colby agreed, and clarified that this is probably one of the items where the FPPB advises the chief of the WSP, although they don't have authority, they can advise him what affect I-601 will have on that decision.

Jim Potts questioned why there was such a long time between reviewing the fees, resulting in having to raise them so much at one time. Mary Corso advised that the Fee Study began approximately 18 months ago. Jim Broman also speculated that at the time the fees were set, and subsequent to that, there was a change of leadership for the Fire Protection Bureau and the Washington State Patrol. He also recalled that the program was being subsidized by private contractors. He further explained that with the possibility of reduction in the Navy contract, something proactive needs to be done. Mary advised that a budget proposal an item that will be put forward for a subsidy for the FTA, in order to keep costs down. She looks forward to working with the Board on this. Sharon Colby requested that documentation be kept on the impact this may have on attendance, with the view in mind of going to the legislature some time in the future to discuss substantial funding.

Jim Broman revisited the issue of repairs at the FTA. Mary clarified that when the Chief met with the Board in January, he reported that \$180,000 was made available to accomplish the needed repairs at the FTA. A letter was sent to all of the major fire service organizations thanking them for their support and advising that the repairs are underway. The classroom ventilation has been completed, a roof has been replaced, and the Burn Building is being worked on now. Testing is being conducted on doors and windows, to ensure that swelling is not a factor in opening and closing. This process will be completed by the end of the year.

Firefighter I Program – Mary advised that Mr. George Quick tendered his resignation in January. With the current hiring freeze, it is unclear when a replacement will be made.

Mary further advised that letters are being sent to all the fire departments that have not yet completed training. Currently, there is \$587,000 worth of encumbrances resulting from those people who have applied for the FFI reimbursement, who have not yet submitted their claims for reimbursement.

A letter was received from the Department of Labor and Industries regarding mobile training props that were a part of the FFI program one-time expenditures. The props are located in Spokane, Thurston County, Region 5 & Region 6. As a result of an explosion that occurred 12 months ago in a training trailer, L & I is looking at these props very closely. The issue is the surrounding glass enclosure where the operator sits. A temporary hold has been put on the use of the trainers until documentation is received from the manufacturer.

Mary distributed a copy of the FFI Budget, which shows the program is considerably under spent, however, with the \$587,000 in encumbrances, the allotment should be reduced considerably.

NFIRS - Mary reported that there are currently 165 departments reporting in NFIRS 5.0. She reported that Aether and SunPro have moved their operation out of Washington State. State Fire Marshal Office staff have been working very closely with representatives from Aether, regarding departments who have advised that they have sent their data to SunPro and/or Aether. Staff is working to recapture this data. A letter has been sent out to all departments in the state, advising that they can either email their data directly to the NFIRS email address, or send it to our office. Anjela Foster is currently working with Aether staff to determine if older versions of the NFIRS data can be converted or captured for analysis.

Top Grant – Mary advised that the first round of grant applications for the \$321,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Commerce were reviewed. 78 departments will be receiving computers, software and Internet connections. A second round of applications will be distributed in October, with awards made in January 2003.

Sharon Colby asked that for those departments who are not currently reporting, if there is a feel that they are not reporting due to the lack of equipment/resources, or is it more that they are still resistant to the idea of taking the time to do the reports. Mary replied that it is probably due to all of those factors. She advised that when the smaller fire departments are contacted regarding their data and they advise that they only have 2-5 fires each year, efforts are made to hook them

up with another large fire department in their area, who will report their data.

STATE FIRE DEFENSE COMMITTEE – Jim Graue, Chair of the State Fire Defense Committee advised that a draft copy of the 4th Edition of the State Fire Services Resource Mobilization Plan was distributed directly by mail to the Fire Protection Policy Board for their review. A cover letter was included which summarizes the changes. He advised that there are issues remaining, which include:

Personnel Compensation – The SFDC is examining to examine and develop alternatives for consideration.

Private Contract Resources – Jim stated that the fire service mobilization plan is for fire service resources. He clarified that there is mechanism that allows private resources to contract with a jurisdiction.

Jim Broman questioned that if his department needed to contract with a private resource, that they would then become a part of his operation, could he submit a claim that includes the cost of his contract with the private resources? Jim Graue advised that this was correct. Jim Broman then asked what assurances he would have that he would be reimbursed for these claims? Jim Graue stated that it was an “unwarranted fear” that the claim would be reviewed and rejected by the State Fire Defense Committee or the Emergency Management Division of the Military Department. Mary Corso also pointed out that the local jurisdiction must ensure that privately contracted resources are trained to the level that they need to be, in order to be on the fire scene.

Dave Wakefield commented on mobilization and private contractors. He feels that there is a perception/ethical issue that could be perceived by some people. He further advised that mobilization, in the intent of the original legislation, was intended to provide reimbursement to make jurisdictions whole. The private sector is for profit. It is important to not mix the for-profit perception and the reimbursement intent.

Jim Graue advised that the fire service will be affected by findings from the 30-Mile Fire incident, where four firefighters lost their lives. He feels that there will be a very sharp focus on training, experience, qualifications and equipment of the resources deployed on mobilized incidents. Mary stated that her office will electronically forward a copy of the 30-Mile Fire Accident Prevention Plan.

Jim Broman questioned if there would be anything done with the language in the plan to give clear guidance to the decision makers regarding an “event certain” incident. Jim Graue stated that the Appendix C Form, which is the request for mobilization, focuses on event potential -not what is happening right now, but what the threat/peril may be. If this form is properly completed with a focus on the aspects of incident potential, there should not be a problem.

Jim Broman also asked for clarification on time commitment. When the agency commits, they are committed for 14 days, when personnel commit, they are committing for 72 hours. He asked if this means that the agency is responsible for the change out costs for replacements, including travel time. Jim Graue advised that this is correct. Mobilization is only paying for 14 days of

people on scene, regardless of how many change outs occur. He clarified that the agency is responsible for change out costs, as it is done at their option.

Sharon Colby had questions on the section dealing with Incident Command. Sharon has heard that people that are properly trained for the IC teams and positions are starting to retire and that the resource for these types of people may be dwindling. Jim Graue advised that Washington State has five Incident Command Teams, and a pool of alternates. They do sustain the ability to field at any one time, five full teams. He advised succession planning will always be a necessary fact, and that it is vital to encourage more fire service involvement in IC activities. Mark Kahley advised that training must be heavily emphasized as the labor pool will not be at the same level.

Sharon Colby asked what the timelines and approximate costs are for training to reach the level of the Incident Management Team. Jim Graue advised that it depends on what level you are performing. There are several levels you can come through: planning, finance, logistics, etc. Sharon also asked who pays for training, and if there is anything that the FPPB can do to encourage training. Jim Graue replied that it is more an issue of time to devote to training, and not money.

Sharon Colby requested that the State Fire Defense Committee develop a list identifying issues that affect the mobilization plan be added to the pending list and revisited on an on-going basis. She further asked Jim Graue to advise the State Fire Defense Committee that the Fire Protection Policy Board is interested in the issues that may affect the resources that are available, and asked that the State Fire Defense Committee provide some possible solutions to be brought forward to the Fire Protection Policy Board.

In response Jim Broman's question regarding the Board's authority in mobilization, it was clarified that the Board's authority for this comes in RCW 38.54.030.

Joe Coultman provided an overview of the information compiled by the committee for preparation of the draft Governor directed Mobilization Efficiency and Effectiveness Study. In regards to the Formal Audit Mechanism (Page 3 - #6 of the attached draft) Joe pointed out that it is very important that the career departments know what kind of equipment they have (Class I, Class II, etc.) He advised that many career departments are being sent to an incident with a Class I engine, where they are not required. Joe stated this needs to be mitigated by developing alternatives – instead of sending off a Class I engine initially, maybe just the staff and the PPE equipment could be sent in a mini-van.

Mary Corso distributed a draft copy of the Mobilization Efficiency and Effectiveness Study. All of the information discussed by the committee was used to develop the recommendations: A final report will be provided when published.

Revisions to Mobilization Plan:

MOTION: Jim Potts moved to adopt the draft policy and forward it on to the Department of Military's Emergency Management Division. Motion seconded by Joe Coultman.

Discussion on the Motion: Jim Broman stated that he planned to vote in favor of the motion, but advised that he has not had the opportunity to discuss this with the State Fire Chief's Board. He referred to the language in statute 38.54.030 that states the Fire Protection Policy Board "will consult with and solicit recommendations from representatives of state, local fire and emergency management organizations." He feels that this statute compels them, as board members, to have consultation with their constituents, prior to voting on the adoption of the revisions.

Mary Corso advised that Glen Woodbury, Director of Emergency Management, expressed concerns regarding the language in 10.5 of the proposed plan, which refers to private contracted resources, and feels that the language may be viewed as inflammatory to the contract associations. She advised that testimony at the legislature indicated that the SFDC and the FPPB has not worked with their organizations to enable them to work on fire mobilizations. Therefore, the language in 10.5 could be viewed as specifically excluding them from the process. Mark Kahley agreed that this language could be viewed as a red flag to the contractors.

Sharon Colby suggested adding an amendment to the motion, deleting 10.5 completely and to go ahead and approve the rest of the plan, and in the meantime, have the State Fire Defense Committee re-work section 10.5 and bring back to the Fire Protection Policy Board at a later time.

At Joe Coultman's request, Mary restated the concern received from Glen Woodbury: "Under certain conditions and consistent with the State CEMP, the state EOC may order, and/or contract for commercially available resources, as needed, by competent local authorities to alleviate threats to life, property and the environment."

Following a lunch break, the Sharon Colby requested that Jim Potts re-state the motion on the floor, as he would like it to read.

MOTION: Jim Potts moved to accept the report from the State Fire Defense Committee, with the following language change to 10.5, and forward the plan on to EMD.

10.5 Private Contract Fire Resources

Private contract resources may contract with a local fire protection jurisdiction, and under the terms and conditions of that agreement become a resource of that jurisdiction. These private contract resources may then be mobilized as fire protection jurisdiction resources. In such a case, the resource is seen and identified as from the local fire protection jurisdiction, and the Mobilization Plan governs all practices, payment conditions, and rates, just as it does for all other state mobilization resources.

Under certain conditions and consistent with the State's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, the State EOC may order and/or contract for commercially available resources as needed by competent local authority to

alleviate threats to life, property, and the environment.

The **motion was seconded** by Pat Jollota.

Discussion on the Motion: Jim Broman restated his concern regarding the 14 day and 72 hour commitment.

Motion carries. Unanimous.

Jim Broman expressed a concern regarding the Geographical Board. His concern is that a collaborative body would get together to make policy decisions, and those policy decisions would get translated into the plan without the benefit of public debate. Mary clarified that the Geographical Board has no impact on the Mobilization Plan, that it only deals with issues relating to the Integrated Incident Management Teams.

E911 Report – Jim Potts provided an overview of the following two bills that are making their way through the process:

SB 6034 – Adds an additional .45 per month tax on cell phones, to bring them up to the same level of tax paid on a wire line phone. This bill passed on Monday, with an amendment that states that if a county imposes a moratorium on cell towers, that during the time the moratorium is in place, the county can not collect the tax on the cell phones.

HB 2595 – This bill, which is the exact same bill word for word, passed out of the House with no amendment.

Jim Potts advised that he is very hopeful that this bill will pass this year, and he very much appreciates the work of the state Fire Chiefs and others in help to move this along.

Jim Broman referred to 38.53.040, which directs that all regional plans be approved by the FPPB. He stated that he never seen a regional plan, and inquired that if by approving the state plan, also means that all the regional plans are approved. Mary Corso advised that the FPPB has not reviewed the regional plans since she has been on board, but feels the Board relied on the SFDC to act on behalf of the FPPB in approving the regional plans.

cc: Ms. Laura Vandemeer, Washington Military Department

MOTION: Jim Broman moved to adopt strategic objectives for the Fire Protection Policy Board for the biennium, which include:

- A. Identification of critical gaps in local fire protection;
- B. Develop and promote strategies to fill the identified service gaps;
- C. Be a focus/advocate for Washington fire and emergency services;
- D. Promote/ensure interoperability between local, state and federal emergency response,

and

Further, to carry out these objectives the Fire Protection Policy Board shall:

- Convene quarterly in work sessions
- Quarterly in business session
- Direct the Chair to meet regularly with fire and emergency services stakeholders, and
- Produce an annual report to the Governor regarding findings and recommendations.

Discussion on the Motion: In discussion regarding the current budget timeline, Mary advised the Board that anything that would go forward now, has to meet the March 25 deadline. This would include work the Board would be looking at as they move through the process. The items listed above in Jim Broman's motion regarding policy development would include meetings, staff work and travel. Jim Broman pointed out that adopting the preceding strategic objectives, and getting them included in the budget does not mean that they cannot be changed, but it does ensure a placeholder in the budget process. Sharon Colby questioned how this would be reflected in the actual budget, as Mary advised that the Board's expenses are part of the administrative costs. Sharon asked if this meant that a separate line item would be needed to identify the cost of operating the Policy Board. Mary explained that this would be similar to the FFI Program. There could be a project code identifying the FPPB. Jim Broman stated that he feels the Board should develop a request for funding for operation for the next biennium, and forward it to Mary to be included in the agency budget.

Mary requested one 1-2 Board members to work with her to develop a budget proposal for Board meetings. Jim Broman agreed to fill this role.

Motion was seconded by Mark Kahley. - **Motion passes unanimously**

NAME TAGS – Sharon requested that Ellen look into ordering new nametag badges for all Board members. In discussion it was agreed that the magnets do not seem to work as well as the pin back type.

FPPB PHOTOS – Mary suggested that at the next business meeting, the agency photographer be scheduled to take individual and group photos, which could be used on the Web Page.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING -

- FPPB Budget
- Update on Governor Directed Mobilization Efficiency & Effectiveness Study

Any additional agenda items should be directed to Sharon Colby/

Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:00.

NEXT BOARD MEETING:

May 15, 2002 – 9:00 a.m.

General Administration Building
Room G-3
210 11th Street SW
Olympia, WA

NEXT WORK SESSION:

April 17, 2002 – 9:00 a.m.

General Administration Building
Room G-3
210 11th Street SW
Olympia, WA

Reviewed/Approved by E-mail:

Sharon Colby, Fire Protection Policy Board Chair – (Date)